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Abstract

In this paper the authors discuss four 21st century skills (communication, collaboration, creativity, and critical thinking) that can be manifested through integration of Web 2.0 technologies, resulting in enhanced student communicative competence. Integrating relevant and meaningful multi-media assignments in a world language class fuses 21st century skills with standards-based instruction seamlessly. An overview is provided, sharing the fundamentals of communicative competence, how these 21st century skills are defined, and a brief explanation of the Web 2.0 tools utilized. Highlighted are four technologies that were integrated within a post-secondary language class: VoiceThread, Poll Everywhere, Animoto, and Xtranormal. The authors share the impact these Web 2.0 technologies had upon student communicative competence, their engagement with the content, and their motivation to learn. Finally, implications for future instruction are discussed, giving insights for world language teachers who plan to integrate Web 2.0 tools within their instruction.

Introduction

Communication is the cornerstone of world language learning. In order to capitalize upon communicative opportunities, the authors sought after advanced tools and innovative platforms to advance world language instruction within an ever-changing classroom dynamic. World language teachers work diligently to instruct students on authentic pronunciation, proper grammar and intonation,
cultural nuances of the language in order to successfully communicate in the target language. While the premise of communication hasn’t changed, rapid changes are occurring in how we communicate with one another, through new platforms, applications, and socially mediated sites. In addition, students entering the classroom are a different generation with a different set of expectations and a unique set of needs; of these, the millennial generation crave connectivity 24/7, personalized self-guided learning challenges, and learning environments that are collaborative and cooperative (Raines, 2003 & Jonas-Dwyer & Pospisil, 2004). Students today are digital natives having grown-up with technology and not knowing a world without it (Prensky, 2001). To them, technology is a tool for learning not a superfluous frill or afterthought. “The ‘spaces’ where students learn are becoming more community-driven, interdisciplinary, and supported by technologies that engage virtual communication and collaboration” (Johnson, Smith, Levine & Haywood, 2010, p. 4). To meet these ever changing demands, Web 2.0 tools offer a way to engage students in meaningful and authentic communication while anchoring learning and pedagogy to 21st century skills and world language content standards.

To address these issues and meet the changes occurring within our classroom and community, the authors investigated how Web 2.0 tools could be integrated into instruction to enhance student communicative competence, encourage engagement with content, and foster increased motivation in learning. This study was grounded in the belief that world language instruction should be contextualized, meaningful, rigorous, and relevant. In order to achieve this, thoughtful planning was given to how to integrate Web 2.0 technologies within instruction in order to support 21st century skills development within a standards-based learning environment.

**Defining Communicative Competence**

Communication is a requisite to discuss, discover, and learn about all other concepts. Communicative competence is comprised of grammatical competence, discourse competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence (Canale & Swain, 1980; Canale, 1983 & Savignon, 1997). Grammatical competence is the knowledge of the structure and form of a language; some of which include its morphologic, syntactic, phonemic and graphemic features. The knowledge of the interrelationship between and logic across sentences and phrases is characteristic of discourse competence. An individual with strong discourse competence can aptly judge the relationship between different ideas within a text. Sociolinguistic competence focuses on the recognition and accordance of the rules of interaction; taking turns, appropriate greetings, proper use of formal/informal register, naturalness or overall native-like language. Finally, strategic competence is characterized by the ability to make the most of the language, particularly when compensating for language deficiencies. For instance, it is the ability to successfully circumlocute an idea or concept that an individual lacks the proper name for, or to negotiate meaning during conversation through verbal and nonverbal communication techniques. When skillfully combined, the result is successful communicative competence in which one can express, interpret, and negotiate meaning (Savingnon, 1998).
To assess communicative competence and determine a student’s growth and skill, world language teachers turn to how Communication is defined within the standard. Communicative competence is manifested within the national standard through the interpretive mode, interpersonal mode, and presentational mode of communication (ACTFL, 2012). The interpretive mode of communication is characterized by the ability to interpret and understand spoken and written language whereas the interpersonal mode of communication describes the ability to maintain conversation between two or more individuals. The presentational mode of communication is highlighted by information presented through spoken or written language. When combined, these three modes of communication represent authentic real world communicative settings (ACTFL, 2012). As a result, the authors chose to target the Communication Standard of world language learning when exploring the integration of 21st century skills and Web 2.0 tools.

What are 21st Century Skills?

In 2011, the American Council for Teachers of Foreign Language (ACTFL) in collaboration with the Partnership for 21st Century Skills (P21) developed the World Language ACTFL P21 Skills Map for the foreign language content area. P21 argues for “bridging the gap between how students live and how they learn” (2011b, p. 4). P21’s model has been gaining momentum and impacting educational settings. Since its inception in 2002, a 21st century skills movement has reached 15 state educational systems. With the growing reach and potential impact of the P21 model on education - more classrooms are being affected. P21 skills, “advocate for 21st century readiness for every student. As the United States continues to compete in a global economy that demands innovation, P21 and its members provide tools and resources to help the U.S. education system keep up by fusing the three Rs and four Cs” (P21, 2011b).

Communication

Communication is at the heart of world language instruction and is also a keystone of the P21 skills. In order to be successful in this growing global economy our students must be able to communicate clearly and effectively, to

• articulate their thoughts and ideas through oral and written language;
• listen effectively to others by not just hearing them, but attending to their intention, meaning, knowledge, and perception;
• use communication skills for a variety of purposes and intents;
• effectively utilize multiple technologies and new literacies in order to construct knowledge and validate its impact; and
• “communicate effectively in diverse environments (including multi-lingual).” (P21, 2011a)

These aptitudes that reside under the umbrella skill of communication directly align to the foreign language Communication standard. The Partnership for 21st Century Skills directly promotes and validates the value world language instruction provides.
Collaboration

Charles Darwin said, “In the long history of humankind (and animal kind, too) those who learned to collaborate and improvise most effectively have prevailed.” Collaboration is an essential component within the P21 framework. Individuals need to demonstrate a(n)

- ability to work successfully and respectfully within a diverse team;
- willingness to negotiate and the flexibility to compromise in order to achieve a common goal; and
- aptitude to share workload, valuing individual contributions within the collective team (P21, 2011a).

Friedman writes, “In a flat world, where value is increasingly created, and complex problems solve, by whom you connect with horizontally, having a high trust society is even more of an advantage” (2005, p. 320). This sense of collaboration is vital within a successful world language classroom. Through the creation of a positive, collaborative learning environment students’ affective filters (Krashen, 1982) can be lowered, allowing for greater learning potential.

Creativity

Embedded within the skill of creativity, P21 promotes the ability to think creatively, work creatively with others, and act on creative ideas in order to make practical, innovative contributions (P21, 2011a). Sprenger stresses the importance of utilizing digital technology to foster student creativity and engagement (2010). Creative thinking includes the ability to implement a broad range of idea creation techniques, to develop new and worthwhile ideas, and to analyze and refine existing ideas in order for their optimization and enhancement. Elaborating upon collaboration skills, P21 emphasizes that creativity includes the ability to work in a creative capacity with others, to

- effectively develop, implement, and communicate new ideas to others;
- demonstrate originality and inventiveness while simultaneously recognizing real world limits when adopting new ideas; and
- view failure as an opportunity to learn.

This valuable trait of recognizing the learning and growth potential from mistakes and failures is fundamental to success within world language classrooms. As a student’s monitor develops, s/he must be willing to take risks, recognizing the potential for growth from learning from one’s errors (Krashen, 1982).

Critical Thinking

The Partnership for 21st Century Skills embeds four primary abilities within the larger skill of critical thinking, they include effective reasoning, systems thinking, making judgments and decisions, and solving problems (P21, 2011a). Effective reasoning is the ability to choose and use reasoning (inductive, deductive, etc.) depending upon the situation. The ability to analyze parts of a whole, recognizing how parts interact to produce complex systems describes a systems thinking disposition.
Formulating decisions and judgments is the capability to

- analyze and evaluate arguments, opinions, and evidence-based positions;
- synthesize and evaluate differing perspectives;
- make interpretations and draw conclusions from the analysis; and
- reflect critically upon one's own learning and metacognitive processes.

The fourth component, problem solving, is characterized by the ability to solve unique non-familiar problems via conventional or innovative methods, and pose questions that seek out new perspectives and insightful solutions.

The four C's affiliated with the 21st century skills (communication, collaboration, creativity, and critical thinking) offer a solid framework with which to integrate Web 2.0 technologies and connect with the five C's of foreign language instruction (Communication, Connections, Communities, Culture, and Comparisons). Technology tools integrated within teaching practices can support a standards-based instructional design. According to Grabe and Grabe, “In a tools approach, students learn by applying the technology to a task rather than by being directly “instructed” by the technology” (2007, p. 13).

### Web 2.0 Tools

The Internet and other Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) are influencing how we read, gather information, and communicate (New London Group, 1996). Beyond this, our personal, professional, and academic lives positively imprints by developing technologies including Web 2.0 tools. It is important to investigate how 21st century skills and tools can be used within world language instruction as a result. The following open sourced technologies were researched: VoiceThread, Poll Everywhere, Animoto, and Xtranormal. These four tools were used because they were user friendly, incorporated video tutorials, provided classroom management tools for both student and instructor. In addition, they addressed different learning styles and their interactive websites had easy accessibility for users.

#### VoiceThread

Created by educators for educators, VoiceThread is an online, open source, collaborative slideshow in which conversations surround embedded multimedia (text, images, video, and/or documents). World language teachers have only limited time with students to immerse them in the target language. VoiceThread was chosen as a Web 2.0 tool as it offers a platform to extend world language learning outside the classroom while simultaneously enhancing interactions with the target language (McKeeman, 2012). Additionally, the ability to present and connect to students’ multiple intelligences through the multimodal and multimedia nature of the threads was an attractive feature of this tool.

#### Poll Everywhere

This online platform provides a quick and efficient way to create stylish real-time experiences for events through the use of mobile devices. Poll Everywhere is an instant audience response system using mobile phones, twitter, and the web to gather data and provide instantaneous results. It is an easy way to gather live
responses in any venue: classrooms, presentations, conferences, online settings, web or Twitter. The user is able to set up both the questions and the answers, offering customization of content.

**Animoto**

A social networking web application, Animoto, produces videos from user selected photos, video clips and music. Users can create a movie by uploading pictures from the program or using their personal collection. The final product is a video slide show with music. The uses of Animoto enable the educator as well as the students to create, communicate, collaborate using critical thinking skills in an online environment. As an educator one can choose to narrate history, a short story, a specific moment in time, a ‘how-to’ video, the alphabet or a pre or post video in the target language assisting students and allowing repetition with learning projects. This is an excellent tool for teachers to record students in a language class and upload it. Students can watch and reflect on their performance and/or pronunciation allowing Animoto to provide additional learning opportunities as opposed to other online voice recorder Web 2.0 technologies.

**Xtranormal**

Xtranormal instantly turns words into a 3D animated movie, allowing users to create online movies in minutes from any web browser, anywhere. This technology can support interactive creation of language lessons such as using avatars to create a greeting with an online visual process, watching videos of history in the target language, seeing history come alive, and engaging students with meaningful learning assignments. Users can choose to import their own voice, previously recorded audio clips or select from a text-to-speech built in software system allowing their voices to be converted to English or a different language. This web-based tool enables language learners to create conversations through story telling and movie making using a vast array of animated three-dimensional characters. Language learners apply vocabulary and simple sentences creating conversation via avatars. The technology allows students to practice their vocabulary by recording their voice in a relaxed environment.

**Communicative Competence in Action**

As reflective practitioners, the authors performed action research to explore how Web 2.0 tools and 21st century skills could be utilized within instruction to enhance communicative competence, foster engagement, and impact student motivation. Communicative competence, as previously described, was at the heart of this study. Increasing communication proficiency was emphasized during each lesson. The authors believed that a distinction existed between student engagement and student motivation. Motivation leads to engagement; engagement being a student’s psychosomatic investment in the learning process. When students are engaged in instruction, they are actively learning and interacting with the content. Often when engaged, a student is internally driven to persevere and maintain
focus through a task. While similarities exist, external forces can readily impact a student’s level of motivation. Student motivation is typically determined by environmental factors (Marciano, 2009) and the relevance s/he feels it has in his/her life (Sprenger, 1999).

The study was conducted within a post-secondary introductory Spanish course. The action research followed general qualitative methods (Creswell, 1998), employing specific case study techniques (Stake, 1995 & Yin, 2003). Study participants included post-secondary students, and the instructor. In compliance with IRB (Internal Review Board) guidelines, participants were debriefed on the data that would be collected for the study; in addition, participants agreed to, and signed a letter of informed consent prior to participation within the study. Student participants were a mixture of traditional and non-traditional students with little to no background in the Spanish language. Instruction was delivered through direct methodology coupled with the natural approach to second language acquisition. Whole group instruction was used to introduce new content, individual and collaborative assignments were chosen to review, reinforce, and practice concepts. These assignments integrated Web 2.0 tools, incorporating P21 skills, with one final project where students had the choice to create environments applying vocabulary they had learned in the classroom and learning new vocabulary as they completed their project. These artifacts, completed student assignments and projects, comprised a data set documenting students’ skills and communicative competence. Assessment of these assignments and the final project were scored using a rubric stressing communicative competencies. Data were collected via student participant reflective journal entries conducted after assignments; this data gauged students’ levels of engagement and motivation. Data from field notes and observations collected by the researchers were used to assist in triangulate findings. Data were analyzed through constant comparative analysis and general qualitative analysis (Creswell, 1998).

There were a total of three VoiceThread assignments and three PollEverywhere interactive pre-test review sessions within a seven-week Introduction to Elementary Spanish I course. Additionally, students were given the option for their final, either a written exam or a Web 2.0 project, a voice over PowerPoint via Animoto or Xtranormal. Students chose the latter option. Through thoughtful preparation and planning, developing a cohesive instructional plan for the course and lessons, prior to implementing Web 2.0 activities, the authors were able to reinforce, scaffold, and recycle content (vocabulary, grammar, culture, and overall language learning). Students built upon their prior knowledge and skills, continually recycling content as they learned new material, all the while leading students toward mastery of content. Through researcher observations and supported in student reflective journal entries, some students extended their communicative discourse and expanded upon basic requirements as they become more comfortable with the content, technology, and assignment structure.

VoiceThread Assignments

Of the three VoiceThread assignments, the general structure and objectives of the assignments were similar while the specifics of content changed based upon
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the assignment. For all VoiceThreads, instructions were written and given orally on the initial slide. During the first VoiceThread assignment, students were to demonstrate their competence of basic greetings and introductions (introducing themselves, talking about where they lived, where they were from, their age, etc.) (Appendix A). The next VoiceThread assignment asked students to respond to a series of questions regarding the differences between their family and a Latino or Hispanic family based upon their interpretation of an embedded video (Appendix B). The third VoiceThread had students write an essay and present it orally using the video camera function, stressing the ability to skillfully utilize all four elements of communicative competence (grammatical, discourse, sociolinguistic, and strategic) (Appendix C). Students were asked to introduce themselves within the essay and share information about their backgrounds, interests, likes and dislikes. This assignment stressed authentic language usage that they might encounter when having a conversation with someone in the target language.

With all three VoiceThread assignments, students reported routinely revisiting and reviewing their own contributions as well as those of their peers. One student said, “I think that it was encouraging to be able to record your voice, listen to your recording, and redo it if you were not happy with it. It was also nice if you are a shy person, to not have the whole class looking at you while answering questions.” This concept further carried over to reinforcing student comprehension of general classroom content. The collaborative nature of the VoiceThreads supported critical thinking. Students thoughtfully commented on threads and negotiated meaning and understanding from comments made by their classmates in the target language. This critical thought was reinforced when analyzing student’s responses from their reflective journal entries. VoiceThread allowed for content learning and extended the time students were exposed to input in the target language. A student stated, “I read and interpreted online text differently through VT [VoiceThread] because I could go back and hear what my classmates had said multiple times. In an actual classroom setting you cannot hit the rewind button, so that is an advantage that I felt our class got.” The final projects submitted by students were of higher quality, more substantive, and contained fewer errors than when doing more traditionally based in-class dialogues. It was particularly pleasing to find students wanting to push the boundaries of their proficiency level in order to express themselves and relay their message. Here the students’ strategic competence was enhanced and further developed.

These VoiceThread assignments encouraged collaborative, meaningful dialogues between students. Participants demonstrated their communicative competence via all three modes of communication within each of these assignments. They exhibited their skills related to the interpretive mode of communication when reading instructions and comments and listening to audio comments and video embedded within the slides of the VoiceThread. When performing their dialogues and commenting on others posts, students demonstrated their skills in negotiating meaning and sharing the communicative burden when participating within the interpersonal mode of communication. Presentational modes of Communication
were routinely displayed with each comment, post, and through each completed assignment. Reflective journal entries consistently articulated how students would revise, redo, and polish oral or written comments when completing VoiceThread assignments.

**Poll Everywhere Activities**

Introduced to the class prior to an exam for review, Poll Everywhere engaged students in a whole class environment, and it provided immediate feedback to students. Questions focused on grammar, vocabulary, and culture (Appendix D). Based upon student responses, it was determined if additional reinforcement or revisiting of content was needed. Questions were presented in different formats: binary option, multiple choice, and short answer. This allowed for variances in the taxonomy of thinking skills (Bloom, 1956 & Pohl, 2000) and greater assessment of student comprehension and knowledge.

Communicative competence was achieved through the interpretive mode of communication. Students processed the content individually via one-way, introspective communication. In order to determine student comprehension of content, students presented their responses via text or e-mail.

**Animoto or Xtranormal Final Project**

This cumulative final project had students create simple conversations encouraging creativity and personal expression via the technology platform of their choosing, Animoto or Xtranormal (Appendix E). This project-based assessment allowed students to demonstrate their learning in a more authentic meaningful venue. “In a Web 2.0 world simulation immersive experiences are significantly different” (Borden, 2012). This project demonstrated student’s ability to communicate via interpersonal and presentational modes of communication. During this project as with the VoiceThread assignments, the authors noted how students were spurring themselves to do more with the language they had, pushing the limits of their strategic competence.

**Discussion**

Based upon the data collected and analyzed through student reflective journal entries, student assignments/ artifacts, and researcher observations and field notes, the authors recognized the positive impact the Web 2.0 tools that were used within instruction had upon students overall communicative proficiency, student motivation to learn, and student engagement in learning activities. Students were unable to hide their weaknesses. In a more traditional classroom setting students can rely on others to carry more of the communicative burden or blend into the background of choral responses. Participation within these technology tools forced students to take ownership of their language ability, making it clear to the teacher what content needed to be revisited, and which skills needed reinforcement and review. Poll Everywhere epitomizes checks for comprehension. This tool not only provided immediate feedback to students, allowing them to monitor their own progress and learning, but it also provided a platform for teachers to
gain immediate insight into the class's overall understanding of the content and material. In addition, many of these assignments encouraged collaboration, a P21 skill. As a result of collaboration, students had to negotiate meaning in order to achieve and complete a task. Students learned from one another by analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating what others did, encouraging higher order thinking skills, but most importantly through the use of technology in the classroom, their ability to communicate in the target language was enhanced. “Listening to other peoples comments encouraged me to make a better effort.” This meaningful, contextualized learning and understanding can be used for a lifetime. Animoto and Xtranormal specifically addressed skills of creativity; through this platform students were truly creators of content. VoiceThread assignments stressed critical thinking skills as they sought diverse perspectives, encouraged the evaluation of content, and analysis of opinions.

In analyzing student responses from the reflective qualitative survey, themes emerged regarding communication, motivation, and engagement. Discussion of communicative competence centered on repetition for retention, and improvement of pronunciation. Students shared that through the use of Web 2.0 tools such as VoiceThread and Xtranormal they tended to practice the target language more. Refining, rehearsing and redoing what they wanted to say allowed for more polished products and pronunciation. One student stated, “The VoiceThread helped me learn how to pronounce words better since I had to repeat myself over and over.” An element of communicative competence particularly in a novice level language classroom is target language pronunciation. “Intelligible pronunciation is an essential component of communication competence” (Morley, 1991, p. 488). The authors recognize that there is pedagogical value and power in unrehearsed or cold conversations. However, when learning another language, practice and repetition are quintessential for success. Through the use of these Web 2.0 tools and technologies, repetition was fostered by design. A student stated, “When I would think about my VoiceThread I would have to record it over and over again until I felt it was right.”

As stated earlier, the authors believe that there is distinction between student motivation and student engagement. Students were motivated by that which was of interest to them, the desire for good grades/scores, and the format through which to learn. Having “fun,” finding “excitement,” and being “kept interested and laughing” were all contributing factors for how motivated students were. Several students reported their desire for a good grade was a significant motivating factor. Insightfully, some students shared that they prefer to learn through “hands-on experiences” or via “project-based learning” which lent itself to these types of instructional assignments and activities.

Student engagement with content was most successful when learning activities and assignments were collaborative and allowed for creativity, both 21st century skills (P21, 2011a). Students stated they wanted to do something “unique” or to be able to “show personality” within assignments. One student shared that she not only enjoyed the chance to be creative during the assignment but also sought after the chance. Having test anxiety, she found the opportunity to demonstrate her abilities in
a creative way was preferable. The majority appreciated the chance to collaborate, work with others, and “interact as a team.” A student stated, “I was not just studying from a book, I was interacting with the work so it helped me to retain the info.”

While motivation and engagement did not have a direct correlation to a students’ communicative competence, they were contributing factors to students’ abilities to achieve. The more motivated and engaged a student was, the more potential exited for intake (Krashen, 1982), by extension impacting a student’s communicative competence. Web 2.0 tools like VoiceThread, Xtranormal, and Animoto offered learning platforms to encouraged student motivation, student engagement, and fostered an increase in communicative competence.

Web 2.0 tools have the ability for students to create, evaluate, analyze and apply. Technology had the power to produce higher order thinking skills. Students were able to develop conversations in a virtual environment. Web 2.0 tools enhanced their learning and speaking abilities in a second language. Through these assignments and the integration of Web 2.0 tools, students created simple yet contextualized and authentic conversations using their creativity and expanding their communicative competence.

**Implications**

This study illustrates the potential that exists to positively impact learning when 21st century skills and tools are coupled with sound pedagogy. It is important to note, during this study the authors were diligent when attending to and planning for how the specific Web 2.0 tools were to be integrated within instruction. Very different results may have emerged if researchers had simply inserted a technology tool for an assignment in place of a more traditionally delivered assignment. The metaphor of treating technology integration into instruction like “old wine in new bottles” needs to be avoided (Lankshear & Knoble, 2003). Teachers need to be thoughtful in designing their instruction to align their instructional objectives and outcomes with the 21st century skill and tool that will be the best fit thus achieving the greatest impact on student learning.

This study sought to explore how 21st century skills could be supported with Web 2.0 tools in such a way that student communication skills were enhanced, engagement in rigorous content was fostered, and motivation to learn was encouraged. It was apparent to both the student participants and the authors that all three aims of the study were met. An unsolicited result from this study was the realization of a flipped classroom, the presentation of content outside of class time so that instruction during class can be centered on application and practice of skills. The real power from this study was evident in how students took control of their learning and actively pursued ways to enhance their own learning experience; the teacher, while still a vital element in the classroom, could serve more as a facilitator and differentiate instructional support for each student based upon their individual needs.
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Appendix A
Assignment 1: VoiceThread
Los Saludos [Greetings]

Use a greeting before you begin to say your name, last name, where you are from, where you live and how old you are. Have fun.

Hola clase, [Hello class,]
Este es un video de los Saludos. [You will watch a video on greetings.]
Con sus parejas hablen de los saludos buenos días buenas tardes. [With your partners, talk about greetings.
Good morning, good afternoon.]
Hablen de su edad, su nombre, su apellido y donde viven. Tengan una conversación. [Talk about your age, your name your last name and where you live. Converse.]
Diviértanse adiós. [Enjoy have fun and good bye.]
Appendix B
Assignment 2: VoiceThread.

La Familia [The Family]

Listen to the video then answer the following questions:

¿Cuantos hijos tuvieron (had) tus Padres? [How many children did your parents have?]

¿Cómo se llama tu padre y tu madre? [What are your father and your mother’s name?]

Ejemplo: Mi madre se llama...Mi padre se llama... [Example: My mothers name is… My fathers name is…]

¿Tienes tú un padrino o madrina? [Do you have a Godfather or a Godmother?]

¿Cómo se llama tu mascota y que es? [What is the name of your pet?]

Mi mascota se llama...[My pets name is…]

Nombra una diferencia entre tu familia y una familia hispana o latina? [Name a difference between your family and a Hispanic or Latin family?]

Appendix C
Assignment 3: VoiceThread.

Ensayo Personal [Personal Essay]

Escribe un ensayo personal en Español. El primer párrafo incluye tus datos personales. Tu nombre, apellido, la edad, donde vives etc. Escribe el mínimo de cinco oraciones. [Write a personal essay in Spanish. In the first paragraph include you personal information. Your name, last name, age, where you live. Write a minimum of five sentences.]

En el segundo párrafo escribe sobre tu familia. Menciona tus padres, hermanos, hijos, hermanastros o mascotas etc… Escribe el mínimo de cinco oraciones. [In the second paragraph write about your family. Talk about your parents, brothers or sisters, stepbrothers, children or pets etc…Write a minimum of five sentences.]

Mi madre se llama....[My mothers name is…]

Mi padre se llama.... [My fathers name is…]

Tengo un esposo, esposa, hijo etc.... [I have a spouse, son, etc…]

El en tercer párrafo escribe lo que te gusta. Escribe el mínimo de cuatro oraciones (sentences). [In the third paragraph talk about what you like. Write a minimum of four sentences.]

Me gusta... No me gusta [I like…. I do not like…]

Me gusta mucho... [I like to …very much]

Me gusta más.... [I like ___more.]
En el último párrafo usa las palabras de los rasgos físicos de acuerdo a tú persona. Escribe el mínimo de cuatro oraciones. [On the last paragraph describe yourself using physical traits. For example, if you are tall, short, your color of eyes or any other physical trait you wish to list. Write a minimum of four sentences.]

Once you have completed writing your essay. Upload your assignment on VoiceThread using a Webcam and try not to read directly from your paper.

Appendix D
## Appendix E
### Final Project Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introductions</strong></td>
<td>Two introductions and two farewells are present.</td>
<td>There is one introduction and one farewell.</td>
<td>An introduction or a farewell is missing.</td>
<td>Introductions and farewells are missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar</strong></td>
<td>Fewer than five errors in sentence structure.</td>
<td>Fewer than four errors in sentence structure.</td>
<td>Fewer than three errors in sentence structure.</td>
<td>No sentence structure in presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary Content</strong></td>
<td>Covers topic in depth with details and examples. Subject knowledge is excellent. Subject vocabulary is covered in target language. More than 5 vocabulary examples are mentioned reference chosen subject.</td>
<td>Includes essential knowledge about the topic. Subject knowledge appears to be good. Subject vocabulary is covered in target language. Four or less vocabulary examples are mentioned reference chosen subject.</td>
<td>Includes essential information about the topic. Subject vocabulary is covered in target language. Three or less vocabulary examples are mentioned reference chosen subject.</td>
<td>Content is minimal OR there are many factual errors. Spanish subject vocabulary is not covered. Less than 2 examples are mentioned reference chosen subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation</strong></td>
<td>Well-rehearsed. Smooth delivery of presentation. Holds the audience attention.</td>
<td>Rehearsed with fairly smooth delivery that holds audience attention most of the time.</td>
<td>Delivery not smooth, but able to maintain interest of the audience most of the time.</td>
<td>Delivery not smooth and audience attention often lost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Originality</strong></td>
<td>Presentation shows a large amount of original thought. Ideas are creative and inventive.</td>
<td>Product shows some original thought. Work shows new ideas and insights.</td>
<td>Uses other people’s ideas (Giving them credit), but there is little evidence of original thinking.</td>
<td>Uses other people’s ideas, but does not give them credit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>